

10/799,516

Amdt. dated Dec. 1, 2005

Reply to Office action of Sep. 8, 2005

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS****35 USC § 102(b)**

Claims 21-25 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Larsen. The applicant disagrees. In fact, it is entirely unclear to the applicant how the Office had arrived at her conclusion.

The Examiner states in the Office action that "...Larsen clearly shows a 'bubble cap' distribution device in which the tray is a riser tray..." and that the "...Vanes [are] configured as 'Chevron-type vanes'..." In contrast, the claims are not directed to a bubble cap, but to a rough distribution device. Should the Office maintain the current rejection, a detailed element-by-element analysis is respectfully requested.

To make the claimed subject matter even more clear, the applicant amended the claims as shown in the previous section. What is required (among other elements) is an upstream mixing chamber that provides flow of a fluid in one direction to a space between an upper and lower plate in which a plurality of vanes are arranged such that the fluid exits the space through passageways while changing direction at least two times. Clearly, amended claims 21-25 are not anticipated by Larsen.

**REQUEST FOR ALLOWANCE**

Claims 21-25 are pending in this application. The applicant requests allowance of all pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

RUTAN &amp; TUCKER

By 

Martin Fessenmaier, Ph.D.

Reg. No. 46,697

Tel.: (714) 641-5100